arXiv:1701.06467v1 [math.AP] 23 Jan 2017

Non null controllability of the Grushin operator in 2D

Armand KOENIG*
Université Côte d'Azur

January 24, 2017

Abstract

We are interested in the exact null controllability of the equation $\partial_t f - \partial_x^2 f - x^2 \partial_y^2 f = \mathbb{1}_\omega u$, with control u supported on ω. We show that, when ω does not intersect a horizontal band, the considered equation is never null-controllable. The main idea is to interpret the associated observability inequality as an L^2 estimate on entire functions, which Runge's theorem disproves. To that end, we study in particular the first eigenvalue of the operator $-\partial_x^2 + (nx)^2$ with Dirichlet conditions on $(-1, 1)$ and we show a quite precise estimation it satisfies, even when n is in some complex domain.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Outline of the proof **3**

3 Estimates for the holomorphy default operators **7**

4 Spectral analysis of the Fourier components **14**

5 Proof of the non null-controllability of the Grushin equation **20**

*This work was partially supported by the ERC advanced grant SCAPDE, seventh framework program, agreement no. 320845

AMS 2010 subject classification: 93B05, 93B07, 93C20, 35K65, 30A10, 34L15

Keywords: null controllability, observability, degenerate parabolic equations

6 Conclusion and open problems 24

Appendix A The stationary phase theorem 25

Appendix B Newton's method 27

Appendix C Two variations on the non null controllability of the Grushin equation 28

1 Introduction

1.1 The problem of controllability of the Grushin equation

We are interested in the following equation, where $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{R} \setminus 2\pi\mathbf{Z}$, $\Omega = (-1,1) \times \mathbf{T}$ and ω is an open subset of Ω:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t f - \partial_x^2 f - x^2 \partial_y^2 f = \mathbb{1}_\omega u \quad \text{on } \Omega \\ f|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

It is a control problem with state f and control u supported on ω. More precisely, we are interested in the exact null controllability of this equation:

Definition 1. We say that the Grushin equation is null-controllable on ω in time $T > 0$ if for all f_0 in $L^2(\Omega)$, there exists u in $L^2([0,T] \times \omega)$ such that the solution f of:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t f - \partial_x^2 f - x^2 \partial_y^2 f = \mathbb{1}_\omega u \\ f|_{\partial\Omega} = 0 \\ f(0) = f_0 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

satisfies $f(T) = 0$.

We show in this paper that if ω does not intersect a horizontal band, then the answer is negative whatever T is:

Theorem 2. *Let $[a,b]$ be a non trivial segment of $\mathbf{T}$ and $\omega = (-1,1) \times (\mathbf{T} \setminus [a,b])$. Let $T > 0$. The Grushin equation in not null-controllable in ω in time T.*

1.2 Bibliographical comments

This equation has previously been studied on $(-1,1) \times (0,1)$, and some results already exist for different controllability sets. Controllability holds for large time but not in small time if $\omega = (a,b) \times (0,1)$ with $0 < a < b$, as shown by Beauchard,

Cannarsa and Guglielmi [3], and holds in any time if $\omega = (0, a) \times (-1, 1)$ with $0 < a$, as shown by Beauchard, Miller and Morancey [4].

The controllability of the Grushin equation is part of the larger field of the controllability of degenerate parabolic partial differential equations of hypoelliptic type. For the non-degenerate case, controllability is known since 1995 to hold when Ω is any bounded C^2 domain, in any open control domain and in arbitrarily small time [13, 11]. For parabolic equations degenerating on the boundary, the situation is well understood in dimension one [8] and in dimension two [9]. For parabolic equations degenerating inside the domain, in addition to the already mentioned two articles on the Grushin equation, we mention articles on Kolmogorov-type equations [2, 7], and quadratic hypoelliptic equations on the whole space [5, 6].

2 Outline of the proof

2.1 Observability

As usual in controllability problems, we focus on the following observability inequality on the adjoint system, which is equivalent by a duality argument to the controllability (definition 1): there exists $C > 0$ such that for all f_0 in $L^2(\Omega)$, the solution f of:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t f - \partial_x^2 f - x^2 \partial_y^2 f &= 0 \\ f|_{\partial\Omega} &= 0 \\ f(0) &= f_0 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

satisfies:

$$\int_\Omega |f(T, \cdot)|^2 \leq C \int_{[0,T]\times\omega} |f|^2 \tag{3}$$

The rest of this article is devoted to finding a counterexample to the previous observability inequality when $\omega = (-1, 1) \times (\mathbf{T} \setminus [a, b]) = (-1, 1) \times \omega_y$.

2.2 Fourier components: eigenvalues and eigenfunctions

To find such a counterexample, we look for solutions of the Grushin equation (2) that concentrate near $x = 0$. To that end, we remark that, denoting $v_{n,k}$ an eigenfunction of the operator $-\partial_x^2 + (nx)^2$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions on $(-1, 1)$ associated with eigenvalue $\lambda_{n,k}$, $\Phi_{n,k}(x, y) = v_{n,k}(x)e^{iny}$ is an eigenfunction of the Grushin operator $-\partial_x^2 - x^2\partial_y^2$ with eigenvalue $\lambda_{n,k}$. In addition, we expect that the first eigenfunction $v_n = v_{n,0}$ of $-\partial_x^2 + (nx)^2$ on $(-1, 1)$ is close to the first eigenfunction of the same operator on $\mathbf{R}$, that is $v_n \sim (\frac{n}{4\pi})^{1/4} e^{-nx^2/2}$, and that the associated eigenvalue λ_n is close to n. So it is natural to look for a

counterexample of the observability inequality (3) among the linear combinations of $\Phi_n(x,y) = v_n(x)e^{iny}$ for $n \geq 0$.

The previous observations on v_n and λ_n were already mentioned by Beauchard, Cannarsa and Guglielmi [3], and we will strengthen their results on that subject in section 4: we will prove that $\lambda_n - n = \gamma(n)e^{-n}$ with γ holomorphic on domains $\{|\arg(z)| < \theta, |z| > r(\theta)\}$ and satisfying estimates of the form $|\gamma(z)| \leq C_\theta(1+|z|)^{3/2}$ on those domains, and that $v_n(x)$ satisfies properties similar to γ_n.

2.3 The toy model

Let's write the observability inequality on functions of the form $\sum a_n v_n(x)e^{iny}$ (noting $\omega_y = \mathbf{T} \setminus [a,b]$ so that $\omega = (-1,1) \times \omega_y$):

$$\sum_n |a_n|^2 e^{-2\lambda_n T} \leq C \sum_{n,m} a_n \overline{a_m} \int_{-1}^{1} v_n v_m \int_0^T e^{-(\lambda_n+\lambda_m)t}\,\mathrm{d}t \int_{y\in\omega_y} e^{i(n-m)y}\,\mathrm{d}y \tag{4}$$

Now let's proceed by heuristic arguments to see what we can expect from the previous estimates on the eigenvalues λ_n and the eigenvectors v_n. We imagine that in the previous inequality, $\lambda_n = n$ and $\int_{-1}^{1} v_n v_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}}(nm)^{1/4}\int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-(n+m)x^2/2}\,\mathrm{d}x = \sqrt{2}\frac{(nm)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{n+m}}$, which does not decay very fast off-diagonal, so we further imagine that $\int_{-1}^{1} v_n v_m = 1$. Then, with these approximations, the previous observability inequality reads:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_n |a_n|^2 e^{-2nT} &\leq C \sum_{n,m} a_n \overline{a_m} \int_{[0,T]\times\omega_y} e^{-(n+m)t+i(n-m)y}\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &= C \int_{[0,T]\times\omega_y} \left|\sum a_n e^{-nt+iny}\right|^2 \mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

This suggests that the controllability problem of the Grushin equation (1) is similar to the following model control problem: let's consider the Hilbert space $\{\sum_{n\geq 0} a_n e^{iny}, \sum |a_n|^2 < +\infty\}$, $|\partial_y|$ the unbounded operator on this space with domain $\{\sum a_n e^{iny}, \sum n^2|a_n|^2 < +\infty\}$ defined by $|\partial_y|(\sum a_n e^{iny}) = \sum n a_n e^{iny}$. Then the controllability of the operator $|\partial_y|$ on an open set $\omega = \mathbf{T} \setminus [a,b]$ in time T is equivalent to the previous "simplified" observability inequality (5). Since this is rather easy while showing the main idea of the proof of the non controllability of Grushin's equation, let's prove now that this model is not null controllable on ω_y:

Theorem 3. *Let $[a,b]$ be a nontrivial segment of $\mathbf{T}$, $\omega_y = \mathbf{T} \setminus [a,b]$ and $T > 0$. The operator $|\partial_y|$ is not null controllable on ω_y in time T.*

Incidentally, this is an answer to a specific case of an open problem mentioned by Miller [15, section 3.3] and again by Duyckaerts and Miller [10, remark 6.4].

Proof. The right hand side of the observability inequality (5) suggests to make the change of variables $z = e^{-t+iy}$, whose Jacobian is equal to $|z|^2$, so if we note $\mathcal{D} = \{e^{-T} < |z| < 1, \arg(z) \in \omega_y\}$, the right hand side of the observability inequality (5) is equal to[1] $C \int_{\mathcal{D}} |\sum a_n z^{n-1}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}|z|$.

About the left hand side, we first note that by writing the integral on a disk $D = D(0,r)$ of $z^n \bar{z}^m$ in polar coordinates, we find that the functions $z \mapsto z^n$ are orthogonal on any disk. So, again by writing the integral in polar coordinates, for all entire functions $f(z) = \sum a_n z^n$ with $f(0) = 0$: $\int_{D(0,e^{-T})} |f(z)|^2 |z|^{-2} \,\mathrm{d}|z| = 2\pi \sum |a_n|^2 \int_0^{e^{-T}} |r|^{2n-1} \,\mathrm{d}r = 2\pi \sum |a_n|^2 e^{-2nT} \frac{1}{2n} \leq 2\pi \sum |a_n|^2 e^{-2nT}$.

So the observability inequality (5) implies the following "holomorphic observability inequality": for some $C' > 0$ and for all functions f holomorphic in the unit disk $D(0,1)$ which are in $L^2(D(0,1))$:

$$\int_{D(0,e^{-T})} |f|^2 \leq C' \int_{\mathcal{D}} |f|^2 \tag{6}$$

We will disprove it thanks to Runge's theorem, whose proof can be found in Rudin's famous textbook [16, theorem 13.9]. More specifically, we will need the following special case:

Property 4 (Runge's theorem)**.** Let U be a connected and simply connected open set of $\mathbf{C}$, and let f be an holomorphic function on U. There exists a sequence (f_n) of polynomials that converges uniformly on every compact subsets of U to f.

Let $\theta \in \mathbf{T}$ non-adherent to ω_y (for instance $\theta = (a+b)/2)$). We choose in the previous theorem $U = \mathbf{C} \setminus e^{i\theta}\mathbf{R}_+$ (see figure 1) and $f(z) = \frac{1}{z}$. Since $z \mapsto \frac{1}{z}$ is bounded on $\mathcal{D}$, f_n is uniformly bounded on $\mathcal{D}$ and the right hand side of the holomorphic observability inequality (6) $\int_{\mathcal{D}} |f_n|^2 \,\mathrm{d}|z|$ stays bounded. But since $z \mapsto \frac{1}{z}$ has infinite L^2 norm on any nontrivial sector $\{|z| < r, \arg(z) \in \omega_y\}$, the left hand side $\int_{D(0,e^{-T})} |f_n|^2 \,\mathrm{d}|z|$ tends to infinity. □

2.4 From the toy model to the Grushin equation: holomorphy default operators

We aim to show that the heuristics described previously are actually good. To that end, denoting $\lambda_n = n + \rho_n$ and $z(t,y) = e^{-t+iy}$, we rewrite the real observability inequality (3) applied to $f(t,x,y) = \sum a_n e^{-\lambda_n t} v_n(x) e^{iny}$ as:

[1] We denote $\mathrm{d}|z|$ the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbf{C}$; that is if f is integrable on $\mathbf{R}^2$, $\int_{\mathbf{C}} f(z) \,\mathrm{d}|z| = \int_{\mathbf{R}^2} f(x+iy) \,\mathrm{d}x \,\mathrm{d}y$.



Figure 1: In yellow, the domain $\mathcal{D}$, in red, the disk $D(0, e^{-T})$. The thick outer circular arc is the subset ω_y of $\mathbf{T} \simeq \mathbf{U}$. The controllability of the model operator $|\partial_y|$ on ω_y in time T would imply the the control of the $L^2(D(0, e^{-T}))$-norm of entire functions by their L^2 norm on $\mathcal{D}$.

$$\int_{x\in(-1,1)} \left(\int_{y\in\mathbf{T}} |\sum v_n(x) a_n z(T,y)^n |z(T,y)|^{\rho_n}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x$$
$$\leq C \int_{x\in(-1,1)} \left(\int_{(t,y)\in[0,T]\times\omega_y} |\sum v_n(x) a_n z(t,y)^n |z(t,y)|^{\rho_n}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x$$

We then write $|z(t,y)|^{\rho_n} = \sum (-t)^j \frac{1}{j!} \rho_n^j$, and for all entire functions $f = \sum a_n z^n$, $H_{v(x)\rho^j}(f)(z) = \sum v_n(x) \rho_n^j a_n z^n$, so that the previous inequality implies that for all entire functions $f = \sum a_n z^n$:

$$\int_{x\in(-1,1)} \left(\int_{y\in\mathbf{T}} \left| \sum_j \frac{(-T)^j}{j!} H_{v(x)\rho^j}(f)(z(T,y)) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x$$
$$\leq C \int_{x\in(-1,1)} \left(\int_{(t,y)\in[0,T]\times\omega_y} \left| \sum_j \frac{(-t)^j}{j!} H_{v(x)\rho^j}(f)(z(t,y)) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x \quad (7)$$

Since the operators $H_{v(x)\rho^j}$ describe how far this inequality is from the observability inequality (5) of the model, we will call them holomorphy default operators, and will prove in section 3 estimates on those operators. Those estimates will allow

us to prove that if we modify slightly the counterexample to the observability of the model, only the term $j = 0$ in the previous inequality matters, so that the observability inequalities of the model (5) and of the Grushin operator (3) can be disproved essentially the same way.

3 Estimates for the holomorphy default operators

In this section, we prove estimates on holomorphy default operators, i.e. operators on entire functions of the form $H(\sum a_n z^n) = \sum \gamma_n a_n z^n$. We start with the following easy estimate:

Property 5. Let $r > 0$ and (γ_n) be a bounded sequence of complex numbers. We write $H_\gamma(\sum a_n z^n) = \sum \gamma_n a_n z^n$. Then for all entire functions f, $|H_\gamma(f)|_{L^2(D(0,r))} \leq \sup |\gamma_n| |f|_{L^2(D(0,r))}$.

Proof. This is a consequence of the already mentioned fact that the functions $z \mapsto z^n$ are orthogonal on $D(0, r)$. □

But we will need estimates on other domains than disks, so we use another approach. Let's look at the easy example of the operator $H(\sum a_n z^n) = \sum n a_n z^n$. Since we have $H(f)(z) = zf'(z)$, thanks to the Cauchy integral formula, we have for all domains U of $\mathbf{C}$, $\delta > 0$ and $U^\delta = \{z, \text{distance}(z, U) < \delta\}$, $|H(f)|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq \delta^{-1} \sup_{z \in U} |z| |f|_{L^\infty(U^\delta)}$. Under suitable hypotheses on (γ_n) and U, we will prove similar estimates for $H(\sum a_n z^n) = \sum \gamma_n a_n z^n$.

The idea is to use the Cauchy integral formula to write $H(f)(z)$ as a convolution operator on the unit circle: $H(f)(z) = \oint_{\partial \mathbf{U}} \frac{1}{\zeta} K(z/\zeta) f(\zeta) \, \mathrm{d}\zeta$ with $K(z') = \sum \gamma_n z'^n$. Then we extend the sum defining K thanks to Poisson's summation formula, which allows us to change the integration path in the expression of $H(f)$ as a convolution on the unit circle.

3.1 Symbols

The class of sequences (γ_n) which will allow us to do all we described just before are the restriction to $\mathbf{N}$ of the following functions:

Definition 6. Let $r : (0, \pi/2) \to \mathbf{R}_+$ be an non-decreasing function, and for θ in $(0, \pi/2)$, let $U_{\theta, r(\theta)} = \{|z| > r(\theta), |\arg(z)| < \theta\}$ and. We note $S(r)$ the set of holomorphic functions on each $U_{\theta, r(\theta)}$ that have sub-exponential growth on those domains.

We endow $S(r)$ with the topology defined by the seminorms $p_{\theta,\epsilon}$ for all $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ defined by $p_{\theta,\epsilon}(\gamma) = \sup_{z \in U_{\theta, r(\theta)}} |\gamma(z) e^{-\epsilon |z|}|$.

In the rest of this article, when we write $S(r)$ it is implicitly assumed that r is a non-decreasing function from $(0, \pi/2)$ to $\mathbf{R}_+$.

Example 7.
- Every bounded holomorphic function on the half plane $\{\Re(z) \geq 0\}$ is in $S(0)$. For instance, $z \mapsto e^{-z}$ is in $S(0)$.
- Every polynomial is in $S(0)$.
- For all $s > 0$, $z \mapsto z^s$ is in $S(0)$.
- More generally, if γ is holomorphic on every domain $U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$ and has at most polynomial growth on those domains, γ is in $S(r)$.

Let's remind that if Ω is an open subset of $\mathbf{C}$, $\mathcal{O}(\Omega)$ is the space of holomorphic functions in Ω with the topology of uniform convergence in every compact subset of Ω. With this notation, here are a few simple facts about $S(r)$, which will be useful later:

Property 8. The space $S(r)$ enjoys the following properties:

- The topology of $S(r)$ is stronger than topology of uniform convergence on every compact.
- For all compact K of $\bigcup U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$, and all $j \in \mathbf{N}$, the seminorm $\gamma \mapsto |\gamma^{(j)}|_{L^\infty(K)}$ is continuous on $S(r)$.
- For all z_0 in the domain of definition of γ, the punctual evaluation at z_0, i.e. $\gamma \mapsto \gamma(z_0)$, is continuous on $S(r)$.
- If γ_0 is in $S(r)$, then $\gamma \mapsto \gamma_0\gamma$ is continuous from $S(r)$ to $S(r)$.

Proof.
- Let K be a compact of $\bigcup_{0<\theta<\pi/2} U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$. By the Borel-Lebesgue property, there is a finite number of θ in $(0, \pi/2)$, say $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_k$ such that $K \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^k U_{\theta_k,r(\theta_k)}$. By noting $R = \sup_{z\in K} |z|$, we then have $|u|_{L^\infty(K)} \leq \sup_{1\leq j\leq k} p_{\theta_j,1}(\gamma)e^R$. This proves the first fact.
- We remind that if Ω is an open subset of $\mathbf{C}$, j is a natural number and K a compact subset of Ω then Cauchy's integral formula implies that the seminorm on $\mathcal{O}(\Omega)$: $f \mapsto |f^{(j)}|_{L^\infty(K)}$ is continuous. Thus, the second point is a consequence of the first.
- Since $\{z_0\}$ is compact, the third point is a direct consequence of the second point (or the first).
- In order to prove the fourth point, we write for $z \in U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$: $|\gamma_0(z)\gamma(z)| \leq p_{\theta,\epsilon/2}(\gamma_0)p_{\theta,\epsilon/2}(\gamma)e^{\epsilon|z|}$, so $p_{\theta,\epsilon}(\gamma_0\gamma) \leq p_{\theta,\epsilon/2}(\gamma_0)p_{\theta,\epsilon/2}(\gamma)$. □

Property 9. We have the following continuous injections between spaces $S(r)$:

- If $r' \geq r$, then denoting $U' = \bigcup U_{\theta,r'(\theta)}$, the restriction map $\gamma \in S(r) \mapsto \gamma_{|U'} \in S(r')$ is continuous.
- Let θ_0 in $(0, \pi/2)$ and $a > r(\theta_0)$. Define $r'(\theta)$ by $r'(\theta) = 0$ if $|\theta| < \theta_0$ and $r'(\theta) = r(\theta)$ otherwise. Then $\gamma \mapsto \gamma(\cdot + a)$ is continuous.

Proof.
- For readability, let's write $U_\theta = U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$ and $U'_\theta = U_{\theta,r'(\theta)}$. To prove the first point, we simply remark that $r' \geq r$ implies $U'_\theta \subset U_\theta$, so, we have: $|\gamma(z)e^{-\epsilon|z|}|_{z\in U'_\theta} \leq |\gamma(z)e^{-\epsilon|z|}|_{z\in U_\theta}$.
- We let the reader check that it makes sense when looking at the domain of definition (drawing a picture can help). The continuity is a consequence of: $|\gamma(z+a)e^{-\epsilon|z|}| \leq e^{\epsilon a}|\gamma(z+a)e^{-\epsilon|z+a|}|$. □

3.2 Holomorphic Fourier transform of a symbol and convolution kernel

We mentioned we wanted to apply Poisson's summation formula to the sum $\sum \gamma(n)z^n$. In order to do that, we need some information on the Fourier transform of γ, the first of which being the existence of it.

We suppose in this subsection that for some θ_0 in $(0, \pi/2)$, $r(\theta_0) = 0$ (so that $r(\theta) = 0$ for $0 < \theta \leq \theta_0$). Then we define the Fourier transform $\hat{\gamma}$ of γ for ξ with negative imaginary part by $\hat{\gamma}(\xi) = \int_0^{+\infty} \gamma(x)e^{-ix\xi}\,\mathrm{d}x$. We first prove that this holomorphic Fourier transform can be extended on a bigger domain than the lower half-plane, then we prove under more hypotheses some estimates on it.

Property 10. Let γ in $S(r)$. The holomorphic Fourier transform $\hat{\gamma}$ of γ, can be holomorphically extended on $\mathbf{C} \setminus i\mathbf{R}_+$.

Proof. Let ϕ in $(0, \pi/2)$, let θ in $(\phi, \pi/2)$ and $r_1 > r(\theta)$. We make a change of contour in the integral defining $\hat{\gamma}(\xi)$: let c the path $[0, r_1] \cup \{r_1 e^{i\varphi}, -\phi \leq \varphi \leq 0\} \cup e^{-i\phi}[r_1, +\infty)$ (see figure 2). We have for ξ in $\{\Im(\xi) < 0\} \cap e^{i\phi}\{\Im(\xi) < 0\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\gamma}(\xi) &= \int_0^{+\infty} \gamma(x)e^{-ix\xi}\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_c \gamma(z)e^{-iz\xi}\,\mathrm{d}z \\
&= \int_0^{r_1} \gamma(x)e^{-ix\xi}\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_0^{-\phi} \gamma(r_1e^{it})e^{-ie^{it}\xi} ir_1e^{it}\,\mathrm{d}t \\
&\qquad + \int_{r_1}^{+\infty} \gamma(e^{-i\phi}x)e^{-ie^{-i\phi}\xi x}e^{-i\phi}\,\mathrm{d}x
\end{aligned}$$



Figure 2: In the left figure: in red, a part of the domain of definition of γ, and in blue, a integration path that allows us to extend $\hat{\gamma}$. In the right figure: in red, the a priori domain of definition of $\hat{\gamma}$, in yellow, the domain we extend $\hat{\gamma}$ to, when choosing the blue integration path of the left figure.

The first two terms can be extended holomorphically on $\mathbf{C}$, while the third can be extended holomorphically on $e^{i\phi}\{\Im(\xi) < 0\}$. So, taking $\phi \to \pi/2$, $\hat{\gamma}$ can be extended holomorphically on $\{\Im(\xi) < 0\} \cup i\{\Im(\xi) < 0\}$. By taking the path c' the symmetric of c with respect to the real line, $\hat{\gamma}$ can also be extended holomorphically on $\{\Im(\xi) < 0\} \cup -i\{\Im(\xi) < 0\}$. □

Property 11. Let $\epsilon > 0$. There exists $C > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ such that for all γ in $S(r)$ satisfying $p(\gamma) := \sup_{|z|<1, |\arg(z)|<\theta_0} \frac{|\gamma(z)|}{|z|} < +\infty$ and for all ξ in $\{-ire^{i\theta}, r > \epsilon, |\theta| < 2\theta_0\}$ (see figure 3):

$$|\hat{\gamma}(\xi)| \leq C(p(\gamma) + p_{\theta_0,\eta}(\gamma))|\xi|^{-2}$$

Proof. The proof is mostly redoing the calculation of the proof of the previous property, but this time using the increased regularity (at 0) to get the stated estimate.

Let $\xi = -ire^{i2\theta}$ with $|\theta| < \theta_0$ and $r > \epsilon$. Thanks to the proof of the previous property, we have $\hat{\gamma}(\xi) = \int_{e^{-i\theta}\mathbf{R}_+} \gamma(z)e^{-iz\xi}\,\mathrm{d}z = e^{-i\theta}\int_0^{+\infty} \gamma(e^{-i\theta}x)e^{-e^{i\theta}xr}\,\mathrm{d}x$. We then write $|\hat{\gamma}(\xi)| \leq \int_0^1 p(\gamma)xe^{-\cos(\theta)rx}\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_1^{+\infty} p_{\theta_0,\eta}(\gamma)e^{\eta x}e^{-\cos(\theta)rx}\,\mathrm{d}x$, which is true for all $\eta > 0$.

For the first term of the right hand side, we make the change of variables $x' = \cos(\theta)rx$, so that $\int_0^1 xe^{-\cos(\theta)rx}\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{1}{(r\cos(\theta))^2}\int_0^{r\cos(\theta)} x'e^{-x'}\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{1}{(r\cos(\theta))^2}\Gamma(2)$.



Figure 3: The sub-exponential growth of γ gives us an estimate on $\hat{\gamma}$ on the red domain, and a change of integration path allows us to extend this estimate on the yellow domain.

For the second term of the right hand side, we have $\int_1^{+\infty} e^{x(\eta-\cos(\theta)r)}\,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{\cos(\theta)r-\eta}e^{\eta-\cos(\theta)r}$ as long as $\eta < \cos(\theta)r$. We then choose $\eta = \frac{\epsilon}{2}\cos(\theta_0)$ so that $|\theta| < \theta_0$ and $r > \epsilon$ implies $\cos(\theta)r - \eta > \cos(\theta_0)\epsilon - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\cos(\theta_0) = \frac{1}{2}\cos(\theta_0)\epsilon$. So $\int_1^{+\infty} e^{x(\eta-\cos(\theta)r)}\,\mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon\cos(\theta_0)}e^{\eta}e^{-r\cos(\theta_0)}$. So, writing $c = \sup_{t>0}(t^2e^{-t})$ and $C_2 = \frac{2ce^{\eta}}{\epsilon\cos(\theta_0)}$, we have $\int_0^{+\infty} e^{x(\eta-\cos(\theta)r)}\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C_2\frac{1}{(r\cos(\theta_0))^2}$.

Combining these two inequalities, we have:

$$|\hat{\gamma}(\xi)| \leq (\Gamma(2)p(\gamma) + C_2 p_{\theta_0,\eta}(\gamma))\frac{1}{\cos(\theta_0)^2}r^{-2} \qquad \square$$

With the previous two properties, we can prove the main tool for establishing estimates on holomorphy default operators:

Property 12. Let γ in $S(r)$ and K_γ the function defined by $K_\gamma(z) = \sum \gamma(n)z^n$. Then K_γ admits an holomorphic extension to $\mathbf{C} \setminus [1, +\infty[$. Moreover, the application $\gamma \in S(r) \mapsto K_\gamma \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{C} \setminus [1, +\infty[)$ is continuous.

Proof. Let G be a connected relatively compact open subset of $\mathbf{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$. We suppose without loss of generality that G intersects the unit disk $D(0, 1)$. We want to show that K_γ can be extended to a bounded holomorphic function on G, and that this extension depends continuously on γ for the topology of uniform convergence on G.

First, we reduce the problem to a case where we can use the previous estimate on the Fourier transform of symbols, by defining $\tilde{\gamma}(z) = \gamma(z + n_1) - \gamma(n_1)$ with n_1

large enough. We can explicitly compute K_γ from $K_{\tilde{\gamma}}$, so we focus on the later, and apply Poisson summation formula to the sum defining $K_{\tilde{\gamma}}$, the estimate on $\hat{\tilde{\gamma}}$ allowing us to holomorphically extend the sum.

Choice of n_1 The Poisson summation formula will involve terms of the form $\hat{\tilde{\gamma}}(i\ln(\zeta) + 2\pi k)$, so we let $F = \{\xi \in \mathbf{C}, e^{-i\xi} \in G\}$. For all ζ in $\mathbf{C}$, $\zeta \in G$ is equivalent to $i\ln(\zeta) \in F$, whatever the determination of the logarithm.



Figure 4: Left figure: in red, the domain F, in plain blue, the boundary of $\{-ire^{i\theta}, r > \epsilon, |\theta| \leq 2\theta_0\}$ and in dotted blue, the boundary of the 2π-periodic version of the previous domain. Right figure: in red, the domain $G = e^{-iF}$, and in blue, the boundary of $\{e^\xi, |\xi| > \epsilon, |\arg(\xi)| > \phi\}$.

Since G is relatively compact on $\mathbf{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$, there exists ϕ in $(0, \pi)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $G \subset \mathbf{C} \setminus \{e^\xi, |\xi| \leq \epsilon \text{ or } |\arg(\xi)| \leq \phi\}$. Then, noting $\theta_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\pi - \phi)$, F is a subset of $\{-ire^{i\theta}, r > \epsilon, |\theta| < 2\theta_0\}$ (see figure 4). Let n_1 be a natural number greater than $r(\theta_0)$, for instance $n_1 = \lfloor r(\theta_0) \rfloor + 1$, let $\tilde{r} : (0, \pi/2) \to \mathbf{R}_+$ defined by $\tilde{r}(\theta) = 0$ for $0 < \theta \leq \theta_0$ and $\tilde{r}(\theta) = r(\theta)$ for $\theta > \theta_0$, and let $\tilde{\gamma}$ defined by $\tilde{\gamma}(z) = \gamma(z + n_1) - \gamma(n_1)$.

According to the second point of property 9, $\tilde{\gamma}$ is in $S(\tilde{r})$ and depends continuously on γ. Moreover, we have for z in $\{|z| < 1, |\arg(z)| < \theta_0\}$, $|\tilde{\gamma}(z)| \leq \sup_{t \in [n_1, z+n_1]} |\gamma'(t)||z|$, so, if we define $p(\tilde{\gamma})$ as in the previous property by $p(\tilde{\gamma}) = \sup_{|z|<1, |\arg(z)|<\theta_0} \frac{|\tilde{\gamma}(z)|}{|z|}$, we have $p(\gamma) \leq \sup_{|z|\leq 1, |\arg(z)|\leq\theta_0} |\gamma'(z + n_1)|$, which is finite since the subset $\{z + n_1, |z| \leq 1, |\arg(z)| \leq \theta_0\}$ is compact in $\bigcup U_\theta$, and thanks to the second point of property 8, $\gamma \mapsto p(\tilde{\gamma})$ is continuous.

Relation between K_γ and $K_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ We have for all ζ in the unit disk:

$$\begin{aligned} K_\gamma(\zeta) &= \sum_{n>r(0)} \gamma(n)\zeta^n \\ &= \sum_{r(0)<n<n_1} \gamma(n)\zeta^n + \zeta^{n_1}\left(\gamma(n_1)\sum_{n\geq 0}\zeta^n + \sum_{n\geq 0}\tilde{\gamma}(n)\zeta^n\right) \\ &= \sum_{r(0)<n<n_1} \gamma(n)\zeta^n + \gamma(n_1)\frac{\zeta^{n_1}}{1-\zeta} + \zeta^{n_1}K_{\tilde{\gamma}}(\zeta) \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

So, if we prove that $K_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ extends holomorphically to G and that the extension depends continuously on $\tilde{\gamma}$ in the topology of uniform convergence on G, we will have proved the same for K_γ.

Poisson summation formula and holomorphic extension We have by definition of $K_{\tilde{\gamma}}$, for all $|\zeta|<1$: $K_{\tilde{\gamma}}(\zeta) = \sum_{n>0}\tilde{\gamma}(n)\zeta^n$. So, the Poisson summation formula implies that for all $|\zeta|<1$:

$$K_{\tilde{\gamma}}(\zeta) = 2\pi\sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}}\widehat{\zeta^x\tilde{\gamma}(x)}(2\pi k) = 2\pi\sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\tilde{\gamma}}(i\ln\zeta + 2\pi k)$$

Let's recall that $F = \{\xi, e^{-i\xi} \in G\}$ is a subset of $\{-ire^{i\theta}, r>\epsilon, |\theta|<2\theta_0\}$, and let's remark that it's a 2π-periodic domain, so if z is in F, then for all $k\in\mathbf{Z}$, $|z+2\pi k|>\epsilon$. So the estimate of Fourier transform of symbols (property 11) implies that the sum $k_{\tilde{\gamma}}(z) := \sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\tilde{\gamma}}(z+2\pi k)$ converges, and satisfies $|k_{\tilde{\gamma}}(z)| \leq C(p(\tilde{\gamma}) + p_{\theta_0,\eta}(\tilde{\gamma}))\sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}}|z+2\pi k|^{-2} \leq C'_\epsilon(p(\tilde{\gamma}) + p_{\theta_0,\eta}(\tilde{\gamma}))$. Moreover, this sum converges uniformly in $z\in F$, so the limit function $k_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ is holomorphic, and depends continuously on $\tilde{\gamma}\in S(\tilde{r})$.

Since we have $K_{\tilde{\gamma}}(\zeta) = k_{\tilde{\gamma}}(i\ln\zeta)$, $K_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ extends holomorphically on $G\setminus[0,+\infty)$. But we already knew that $K_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ is holomorphic on the unit disk, so $K_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ is holomorphic in G. Moreover, since $k_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ depends continuously on $\tilde{\gamma}$, $K_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ also depends continuously on $\tilde{\gamma}$. This completes the proof of the property. □

3.3 Proof of the estimate for the holomorphy default operator

Before stating the estimates for holomorphy default operators, let's define a few notations. Let r be an non-decreasing function from $(0,\pi/2)$ to $\mathbf{R}_+$. We note $r(0) = \inf_{\theta\in(0,\pi/2)} r(\theta)$. Let $\mathcal{O}_{r(0)}$ be the closed subspace of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{C})$ of entire functions of the form $\sum_{n>r(0)} a_n z^n$, i.e. $\mathcal{O}_{r(0)} = \{f\in\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{C}), \forall 0\leq j\leq r(0), f^{(j)}(0)=0\}$. If we endow $\mathcal{O}_{r(0)}$ with the $L^\infty(U)$ norm for some open bounded subset U of $\mathbf{C}$, we will note this space $\mathcal{O}^\infty_{r(0)}(U)$.

Theorem 13. *Let γ in $S(r)$ and H_γ the operator defined by $H_\gamma(\sum_{n>r(0)} a_n z^n) = \sum_{n>r(0)} \gamma(n) a_n z^n$. Let U be an open bounded domain, star shaped with respect to 0, let $\delta > 0$ and $U^\delta = \{z \in \mathbf{C}, \text{distance}(z, U) < \delta\}$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{O}_{r(0)}$, $|H_\gamma(f)|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C|f|_{L^\infty(U^\delta)}$.*

Moreover, the constant C above can be chosen continuously in $\gamma \in S(r)$: the application $\gamma \mapsto H_\gamma$ is continuous from $S(r)$ to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}^\infty_{r(0)}(U^\delta), \mathcal{O}^\infty_{r(0)}(U))$.

Before proving the theorem, let's remark that the sub-exponential growth of γ implies that H_γ do maps $\mathcal{O}_{r(0)}$ to $\mathcal{O}_{r(0)}$, so the theorem actually makes sense.

Proof. Let $R > 0$ large enough so that $\bar{U} \subset D(0, R)$. If $f = \sum a_n z^n$ is an entire function, we have $a_n = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\partial D(0,R)} \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta^{n+1}} \, \mathrm{d}\zeta$, so, for z in U, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} H_\gamma(f)(z) &= \sum_n \gamma_n \frac{1}{2i\pi} \oint_{\partial D(0,R)} \frac{f(\zeta)}{\zeta^{n+1}} z^n \, \mathrm{d}\zeta \\ &= \oint_{\partial D(0,R)} \frac{1}{2i\pi\zeta} K_\gamma\left(\frac{z}{\zeta}\right) f(\zeta) \, \mathrm{d}\zeta \end{aligned}$$

We want to change the integration path for one that is closer to U. For any closed curve c around U, since U is star-shaped with respect to 0, for any $z \in U$ and $\zeta \in c$, we never have $z/\zeta \in [1, +\infty)$. So, the subset $\{z/\zeta, z \in U, \zeta \in c\}$ is a compact subset of $\mathbf{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$, and according to the previous property, $M_c(\gamma) := \sup_{z \in U, \zeta \in c} K_\gamma\left(\frac{z}{\zeta}\right)$ is finite and depends continuously on $\gamma \in S(r)$.

So, we have for $z \in U$, $|H_\gamma(z)| \leq \sup_{\zeta \in c} \frac{1}{2\pi|\zeta|} M_c(\gamma) \sup_c |f|$. Since we can choose c as close as we want to U, this proves the theorem. □

Remark 14. Actually, the theorem we proved is the following: if (γ_n) is a sequence of complex numbers such that the entire series $\sum_{n \geq 0} \gamma_n \zeta^n$ has non-zero convergence radius and that $K_\gamma(\zeta) := \sum_{n \geq 0} \gamma_n \zeta^n$ admits an holomorphic extension on $\mathbf{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$, then, for all bounded open domain U of $\mathbf{C}$ which is simply connected and star-shaped with respect to 0, and for all $\delta > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that for all entire functions f, $|H_\gamma(f)|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C|f|_{L^\infty(U^\delta)}$. Moreover, C can be chosen continuously on K_γ (for the topology of uniform convergence on every compact).

4 Spectral analysis of the Fourier components

In this section, we prove estimates on the first eigenvalue λ_α of $-\partial_x^2 + (\alpha x)^2$ on $(-1, 1)$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions, and on its associated eigenfunction. Let's recall some facts already mentioned by K. Beauchard, P. Cannarsa and R. Guglielmi [3], which are proved thanks to Sturm-Liouville's theory:

Property 15. Let α be a real number. The (unbounded) operator $-\partial_x^2 + (\alpha x)^2$ on L^2 (with domain $H_0^1(-1,1) \cup H^2(-1,1)$) admits an orthonormal base $(v_{\alpha k})_{k\geq 0}$ of eigenvectors, with the associated eigenvalues sequence $(\lambda_{\alpha k})_{k\geq 0}$ being non-decreasing and tending to $+\infty$ as $k \to +\infty$. Moreover, the first eigenvalue $\lambda_\alpha = \lambda_{\alpha 0}$ is simple, greater than $|\alpha|$, and its associated eigenvector $v_\alpha = v_{\alpha 0}$ is even, positive on $(-1,1)$ and non-increasing in $[0,1)$.

From now on, we will normalize v_α so that $v_\alpha(0) = 1$ instead of normalizing it in $L^2(-1,1)$ (we will show later this is actually no big deal).

4.1 Exponential estimate of the first eigenvalue

The main theorem of this section is the following:

Theorem 16. *There exists a space $S(r)$ and a function γ in $S(r)$ such that for all reals $x > r(0)$, $\lambda_x = x + \gamma(x)e^{-x}$.*

Remark 17. We will actually prove that for all θ in $(0, \pi/2)$, $\gamma(z) \underset{\substack{|z|\to\infty \\ z\in U_{\theta,r(\theta)}}}{\sim} 4\pi^{-1/2} z^{3/2}$.

Proof. The proof is in three steps. We first explicitly solve the equation satisfied by v_α for $\alpha > 0$, expressing the solution as an integral on some complex path. Then, writing the boundary condition for this explicit solution constitute an implicit equation satisfied by α and $\rho_\alpha = \lambda_\alpha - \alpha$, this equation still making sense if α is complex with positive real part. We use Newton's method to solve this implicit equation, with the stationary phase theorem providing the necessary estimates for Newton's method to converge. Finally, the stationary phase theorem also implies an equivalent of the solution Newton's method gives us, which will allow us to conclude.

Explicit solution of the equation satisfied by v_α Let's recall that v_α satisfies $-v_\alpha'' + (\alpha x)^2 v_\alpha = \lambda_\alpha v_\alpha$. We have by choice of normalization $v_\alpha(0) = 1$, and since v_α is even $v_\alpha'(0) = 0$. Let w_α defined by $v_\alpha = e^{-\alpha x^2/2} w_\alpha$. By developing the derivatives, we have: $-w_\alpha'' + 2\alpha x w_\alpha' = (\lambda_\alpha - \alpha) w_\alpha$. Finally, we make the change of variables $x = y/\sqrt{\alpha}$, so that $\tilde{w}_\alpha(y) = w_\alpha(y/\sqrt{\alpha})$ satisfies $-\tilde{w}_\alpha'' + 2y\tilde{w}_\alpha' = (\frac{1}{\alpha}\lambda_\alpha - 1)\tilde{w}_\alpha$ as well as $\tilde{w}_\alpha(0) = 1$, $\tilde{w}_\alpha'(0) = 0$, $\tilde{w}_\alpha(\sqrt{\alpha}) = 0$. So, for all real $\tilde{\rho}$, we consider the ordinary differential equation:

$$\begin{aligned} -\tilde{w}'' + 2x\tilde{w}' - \tilde{\rho}\tilde{w} &= 0 \\ \tilde{w}(0) = 1, \tilde{w}'(0) &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Let $g(z) = e^{-z^2/4 - (1+\tilde{\rho}/2)\ln(z)}$ (with the logarithm chosen so that $\ln(1) = 0$ and ln is continuous on the path we will integrate g on). This function satisfies

$-z^2 g - 2(zg)' - \tilde{\rho} g = 0$ on any simply connected domain of $\mathbf{C}^\star$. Let Γ_+ and Γ_- be paths in $\mathbf{C}^\star$ from $-\infty$ to ∞ going above and below 0 respectively. For instance, we can take $\Gamma_+ = (-\infty, -\epsilon] \cup \{\epsilon e^{i(\pi-\theta)}, 0 \leq \theta \leq \pi\} \cup [\epsilon, +\infty)$ and $\Gamma_- = (-\infty, -\epsilon] \cup \{\epsilon e^{i\theta}, -\pi \leq \theta \leq 0\} \cup [\epsilon, +\infty)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Then, by integration by parts, the functions $\tilde{w}_+$ and $\tilde{w}_-$ defined by $\tilde{w}_\pm(y) = \int_{\Gamma_\pm} g(z) e^{-yz}\,\mathrm{d}z$ are solutions of the equation $-\tilde{w}'' + 2y\tilde{w}' = \tilde{\rho}\tilde{w}$. Finally, the solution of the equation (9) is up to a constant:

$$\tilde{w}(y) = \left(\left(1 + e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\tilde{\rho}}\right) \int_{\Gamma_+} - \left(1 + e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}\tilde{\rho}}\right) \int_{\Gamma_-} \right) \exp\left(-yz - \frac{z^2}{4} - \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{2}\right) \ln z \right) \mathrm{d}z$$

where we have defined $(a_+ \int_{\Gamma_+} + a_- \int_{\Gamma_-}) f(s)\,\mathrm{d}s = a_+ \int_{\Gamma_+} f(s)\,\mathrm{d}s + a_- \int_{\Gamma_-} f(s)\,\mathrm{d}s$.

Implicit equation and Newton's method In the case where $\tilde{\rho} = \tilde{\rho}(\alpha) := \frac{1}{\alpha}\lambda_\alpha - 1$, the above solution is up to a constant $\tilde{w}_\alpha$, so α and $\tilde{\rho}(\alpha)$ satisfy $\tilde{w}(\sqrt{\alpha}) = 0$ when $\tilde{\rho} = \tilde{\rho}(\alpha)$. So, let's specify in the above solution $y = \sqrt{\alpha}$ and make the change of variables/change of integration path $z = \sqrt{\alpha}s$, and write $-yz - z^2/4 = -\alpha(1 + s/2)^2 + \alpha$:

$$\tilde{w}(\sqrt{\alpha}) = \sqrt{\alpha} e^{\alpha} \left(\left(1 + e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\tilde{\rho}}\right) \int_{\Gamma_+} - \left(1 + e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}\tilde{\rho}}\right) \int_{\Gamma_-} \right) \exp\left(-\alpha \left(1 + \frac{s}{2}\right)^2 - \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{2}\right) \ln s \right) \mathrm{d}s$$

So, letting $\Phi(\rho, \alpha)$ defined by:

$$\Phi(\rho, \alpha) = \left(\left(1 + e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\rho}\right) \int_{\Gamma_+} - \left(1 + e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}\rho}\right) \int_{\Gamma_-} \right) \exp\left(-\alpha \left(1 + \frac{s}{2}\right)^2 - \left(1 + \frac{\rho}{2}\right) \ln s \right) \mathrm{d}s$$

$\tilde{\rho}(\alpha)$ and α satisfy $\Phi(\tilde{\rho}(\alpha), \alpha) = 0$. We even have the equivalence between $\Phi(\rho, \alpha) = 0$ and $\alpha(1 + \rho)$ being an eigenvalue of $-\partial_x^2 + (\alpha x)^2$ on $(-1, 1)$. Note that the equation $\Phi(\rho, \alpha) = 0$ still makes sense if we take α with positive real part, and, as stated previously, we want to solve it with Newton's method (theorem 24). In order to prove the convergence of Newton's method on suitable sets (i.e. for each $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$, a set $U_{\theta, r(\theta)}$), we need to estimate $(\partial_\rho \Phi)^{-1}$, $\partial_\rho^2 \Phi$, and $\Phi(0, \alpha)$; in particular, we will show that the later decays faster than the two former as $|\alpha|$ tends to $+\infty$.

By differentiating under the integral we have:

$$\partial_\rho \Phi(\rho,\alpha) = i\frac{\pi}{2}\left(e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\rho}\int_{\Gamma_+} + e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}\rho}\int_{\Gamma_-}\right)\exp\left(-\alpha\left(1+\frac{s}{2}\right)^2 - \left(1+\frac{\rho}{2}\right)\ln s\right)\mathrm{d}s$$
$$-\frac{1}{2}\left((1+e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\rho})\int_{\Gamma_+} -(1+e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}\rho})\int_{\Gamma_-}\right)\exp\left(-\alpha\left(1+\frac{s}{2}\right)^2 - \left(1+\frac{\rho}{2}\right)\ln s\right)\ln s\,\mathrm{d}s$$

so, by the stationary phase theorem, with the only critical point being -2 (see theorem 23):

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\rho \Phi(\rho,\alpha) &= \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha}}\Bigg(i\frac{\pi}{2}\left(e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\rho}e^{-(1+\rho/2)(\ln 2+i\pi)} + e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}\rho}e^{-(1+\rho/2)(\ln 2-i\pi)}\right)\\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2}\big((1+e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\rho})e^{-(1+\rho/2)(\ln 2+i\pi)}(\ln 2+i\pi)\\ &\quad -(1+e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}\rho})e^{-(1+\rho/2)(\ln 2-i\pi)}(\ln 2-i\pi)\big)\Bigg)\\ &\quad +\mathcal{O}_{\alpha\in U_{\theta,1}}(|\alpha|^{-3/2})\\ &= i\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha}}2^{-(1+\frac{\rho}{2})}\left(\pi\cos\left(\frac{\pi\rho}{2}\right)-\ln(2)\sin\left(\frac{\pi\rho}{2}\right)\right)\\ &\quad +\mathcal{O}_{\alpha\in U_{\theta,1}}(|\alpha|^{-3/2})\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

the $\mathcal{O}$ being uniform in $|\rho|\leq 1$.

If $\rho_{\max}>0$ is chosen so that for all $|\rho|\leq\rho_{\max}$, $|\pi\cos(\pi\rho/2)-\ln(2)\sin(\pi\rho/2)|\geq\frac{\pi}{2}$, there exists $C'_\theta>0$ and $r(\theta)>0$ such that for all $|\rho|<\rho_{\max}$ and α in $U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$, $|(\partial_\rho\Phi(\rho,\alpha))^{-1}|<C'_\theta\sqrt{|\alpha|}$.

Similarly, $\partial^2_\rho\Phi(\rho,\alpha)$ can be expressed in terms of $\int_{\Gamma_\pm}\exp(-\alpha(1+s/2)^2-(1+\rho/2)\ln(s))\ln(s)^m\,\mathrm{d}s$ with $m\in\{0,1,2\}$, so, by the stationary phase theorem, increasing $r(\theta)$ if need be, there exists $C_\theta>0$ such that for all $|\rho|<\rho_{\max}$ and α in $U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$, $|\partial^2_\rho\Phi(\rho,\alpha)|<C_\theta\frac{1}{\sqrt{|\alpha|}}$.

Now, by explicitly writing the integrals defining Φ, we have for all α with $\Re(\alpha)>0$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(0,\alpha) &= 2\int_{\Gamma_+}\exp\Big(-\alpha\big(1+\frac{s}{2}\big)^2\Big)\frac{1}{s}\,\mathrm{d}s - 2\int_{\Gamma_-}\exp\Big(-\alpha\big(1+\frac{s}{2}\big)^2\Big)\frac{1}{s}\,\mathrm{d}s\\ &= 2\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\int_{\pi}^{-\pi}\exp\Big(-\alpha\big(1+\frac{1}{2}\epsilon e^{i\theta}\big)^2\Big)i\,\mathrm{d}\theta\\ &= -4i\pi e^{-\alpha}\end{aligned}$$

so, increasing again $r(\theta)$ if necessary, we have for all α in $U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$:

$$|\Phi(0,\alpha)| \leq \min((2C_\theta {C'_\theta}^2)^{-1}, \frac{1}{5}{C'_\theta}^{-1})|\alpha|^{-1/2}$$

Then according to theorem 24, with $R = \rho_{\max}/10$, $C_1 = C_\theta|\alpha|^{-1/2}, C_2 = C'_\theta|\alpha|^{1/2}$ and with starting point $z_0 = 0$, the sequence $(\tilde{\rho}_n(\alpha))$ defined by $\tilde{\rho}_0(\alpha) = 0$, $\tilde{\rho}_{n+1}(\alpha) = \tilde{\rho}_n(\alpha) - \partial_\rho\Phi(\tilde{\rho}_n(\alpha),\alpha)^{-1}\Phi(\tilde{\rho}_n(\alpha),\alpha)$ converges and the limit $\tilde{\rho}_\infty(\alpha)$ satisfies $|\tilde{\rho}_\infty(\alpha) - \tilde{\rho}_k(\alpha)| \leq C|A\sqrt{\alpha}e^{-\alpha}|^{2^k}$ for some $C > 0$ and $A > 0$.

Equivalent of the solution and conclusion Let's first prove that $\tilde{\rho}_\infty$ is holomorphic. By induction, every $\tilde{\rho}_k$ is holomorphic, and the estimate $|\tilde{\rho}_\infty(\alpha) - \tilde{\rho}_k(\alpha)| \leq C|Ae^{-\alpha}|^{2^k}$ shows that $\tilde{\rho}_k$ converges uniformly in $U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$ (provided that $r(\theta) > 0$), so $\tilde{\rho}_\infty$ is also holomorphic.

Now let's compute an equivalent of $\tilde{\rho}_\infty$. According to the previous estimate with $k = 1$, we have $\tilde{\rho}_\infty(\alpha) = -\partial_\rho\Phi(0,\alpha)^{-1}\Phi(0,\alpha) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-2\alpha})$ for $\alpha \in U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$. Thanks to the stationary phase theorem, or more specifically equation (10), we have: $\partial_\rho\Phi(0,\alpha) = i\pi^{3/2}\alpha^{-1/2} + \mathcal{O}_{\alpha\in U_{\theta,r(\theta)}}(|\alpha|^{-3/2})$, and $\Phi(0,\alpha) = -4i\pi e^{-\alpha}$. So, we have: $\tilde{\rho}_\infty(\alpha) = 4\pi^{-1/2}\alpha^{1/2}e^{-\alpha}(1 + \mathcal{O}(|\alpha|^{-1})) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-2\alpha})$, and since $e^{-2\alpha} = \mathcal{O}(|\alpha|^{-3/2}e^{-\alpha})$ for $\alpha \in U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$, we finally have $\tilde{\rho}_\infty(\alpha) \sim 4\pi^{-1/2}\alpha^{1/2}e^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$.

We still have to check that for α real, $\tilde{\rho}_\infty(\alpha)$ is equal to $\tilde{\rho}_\alpha$ (let's remind that $\lambda_\alpha = \alpha(1 + \tilde{\rho}_\alpha)$). According to equation (10), we have for some $C''_\theta > 0$ and for all $|\rho| \leq \rho_{\max}$ and $\alpha \in U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$: $\Im(\partial_\rho\phi(\rho,\alpha)) \geq C''_\theta/\sqrt{|\alpha|}$. So for $|\rho| < \rho_{\max}$ and $\alpha \in U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$, $|\Phi(\rho,\alpha)| = |\Phi(\rho,\alpha) - \Phi(\tilde{\rho}_\infty(\alpha))| \geq C''_\theta|\rho - \tilde{\rho}_\infty(\alpha)|/\sqrt{|\alpha|}$. So for α real big enough, $\tilde{\rho}_\infty(\alpha)$ is the smallest non-negative zero of $\Phi(\cdot,\alpha)$.

Let's remind that the eigenvalues of $-\partial_x^2 + (\alpha x)^2$ are exactly all the $\alpha(\rho+1)$ with ρ the zeroes of $\Phi(\cdot,\alpha)$, and that thanks to property 15, these eigenvalues are greater than α. So, we actually have $\lambda_\alpha = \alpha(\tilde{\rho}_\infty(\alpha) + 1)$. □

4.2 Agmon estimate for the first eigenfunction

Thanks to the previous result, we can define v_α for $\alpha \in \bigcup U_{\theta,r(\theta)}$, and since $v_\alpha(x)$ depends analytically on α, we have $v_\alpha(\pm 1) = 0$. We now prove some estimates on v_α:

Property 18. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and ${}^\epsilon w(x)(\alpha) = e^{\alpha(1-\epsilon)x^2/2}v_\alpha(x)$. There exists a space $S(r)$ such that ${}^\epsilon w$ is bounded from $[-1,1]$ to $S(r)$.

Remark 19. The boundedness of ${}^\epsilon w$ is to be understood as the boundedness of the subset $\{{}^\epsilon w(x), x \in [-1,1]\}$ of $S(r)$, which is equivalent to the fact that for all seminorms $p_{\epsilon',\theta}$, the set $\{p_{\epsilon',\theta}({}^\epsilon w(x)), x \in [-1,1]\}$ is a bounded set of $\mathbf{R}$.

Proof. This is mostly a complicated way of stating Agmon's estimate (see for instance Agmon's initial work [1] or Helffer and Sjöstrand's article [12], the later being closer to what we are doing).

Let $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi/2)$. We will to prove that there exists $C > 0$ and $r'(\theta_0)$ such that for all $\alpha \in U_{\theta_0, r'(\theta_0)}$ and $x \in (-1, 1)$, ${}^{\epsilon}w(\alpha)(x) \leq C|\alpha|^{3/4}$, which is enough to prove the stated property. In this proof, we will just note w instead of ${}^{\epsilon}w$, and for convenience, we will note $w_\alpha(x)$ instead of $w(x)(\alpha)$.

For all α, we have: $-w''_\alpha + 2\alpha(1-\epsilon)xw'_\alpha + \big((1-(1-\epsilon)^2)(\alpha x)^2 - \epsilon\alpha - \rho(\alpha)\big)w_\alpha = 0$. Let's write $\alpha = \frac{1}{h}e^{i\theta}$, $\delta^2 = 1-(1-\epsilon)^2$, and multiply the previous equation by $h^2 e^{-i\theta}\bar{w}_\alpha$. We get $-h^2 e^{-i\theta}w''_\alpha\bar{w}_\alpha + 2h(1-\epsilon)xw'_\alpha\bar{w}_\alpha + \big(e^{i\theta}\delta^2x^2 - h(\epsilon + he^{-i\theta}\rho(\alpha))\big)|w_\alpha(x)|^2 = 0$. By integration by parts, we have $-\int_{-1}^{1} w''_\alpha(x)\bar{w}_\alpha(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \int_{-1}^{1}|w'_\alpha(x)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x$ and since $2\Re(w'_\alpha\bar{w}_\alpha) = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}|w_\alpha|^2$, we have $2\int_{-1}^{1} x\Re(w'_\alpha(x)\bar{w}_\alpha(x))\,\mathrm{d}x = -\int_{-1}^{1}|w_\alpha(x)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x$, so integrating the equation and taking the real part, we get the Agmon estimate, valid for all α such that $\rho(\alpha)$ is defined:

$$h^2\int_{-1}^{1}|w'_\alpha(x)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{-1}^{1}\left(\delta^2x^2 - h\frac{1+h\Re(e^{-i\theta}\rho(\alpha))}{\cos(\theta)}\right)|w_\alpha(x)|^2\,\mathrm{d}x = 0 \qquad (11)$$

The final ingredient we need to conclude is a comparison between w_α and $e^{-\epsilon\alpha x^2/2}$, which will give us a control of the L^2 norm of w_α on sets of the form $(-R|\alpha|^{-1/2}, R|\alpha|^{-1/2})$. The function $\tilde{w}$ defined by $\tilde{w}(z) = e^{-\epsilon z^2/2}$ satisfies $-\tilde{w}'' + 2(1-\epsilon)z\tilde{w}' + \delta^2z^2\tilde{w} - \epsilon\tilde{w} = 0$ for z in $\mathbf{C}$, so the solution $\tilde{w}_\rho$ of $-\tilde{w}''_\rho + 2(1-\epsilon)z\tilde{w}'_\rho + \delta^2z^2\tilde{w}_\rho = (\epsilon+\rho)\tilde{w}_\rho$ tends to $e^{-\epsilon z^2/2}$ in $L^2(D(0,R))$ as ρ tends to 0. So, for all $R > 0$, there exists $\rho_{\max}$ such that for $|\rho| \leq \rho_{\max}$, $|\tilde{w}_\rho - e^{-\epsilon z^2/2}|_{L^2(D(0,R))} \leq 1$. But $w_\alpha(x) = \tilde{w}_{\rho(\alpha)/\alpha}(\sqrt{\alpha}x)$, so, if $\rho(\alpha)/\alpha \leq \rho_{\max}$, we have $|w_\alpha - e^{-\epsilon\alpha x^2/2}|_{L^2(|x|\leq R/\sqrt{|\alpha|})} \leq |\alpha|^{-1/2}$. So, there exists $r'(\theta_0) \geq r(\theta_0)$ such that for all α in $U_{\theta_0,r'(\theta_0)}$:

$$|w_\alpha|_{L^2(-R/\sqrt{|\alpha|}, R/\sqrt{|\alpha|})} \leq C_{\epsilon,\theta_0}|\alpha|^{-1/4} \qquad (12)$$

Let $E = \{x \in (-1,1), \delta^2x^2 - 2h/\cos(\theta_0) \leq 0\} = \{|x| \leq \sqrt{2}/(\delta\sqrt{\cos(\theta_0)})|\alpha|^{-1/2}\}$ and $\alpha = \frac{1}{h}e^{i\theta}$ in $U_{\theta_0,r'(\theta_0)}$. We have $|h\Re(e^{-i\theta}\rho(\alpha))| \leq 1$ and $|\theta| < \theta_0$, so, for x in $[-1,1]\setminus E$, $\delta^2x^2 - h(1+h\Re(e^{-i\theta}\rho(\alpha)))/\cos(\theta) > 0$. Thus, thanks to Agmon estimate (11), $h^2|w'_\alpha|^2_{L^2(-1,1)} \leq C'_{\theta_0}|w_\alpha|^2_{L^2(E)}$. But, thanks to inequality (12), we have $|w_\alpha|^2_{L^2(E)} \leq C_{\epsilon,\theta_0}h^{1/2}$, so $|w'_\alpha|^2_{L^2(-1,1)} \leq C'_{\epsilon,\theta_0}h^{-3/2}$.

Finally, for all x in $(-1,1)$, we have: $|w_\alpha(x) - w_\alpha(0)| \leq |w'_\alpha|_{L^1(-1,1)}$, so thanks to Hölder's inequality, $|w_\alpha(x) - w_\alpha(0)| \leq \sqrt{2}|w'_\alpha|_{L^2(-1,1)} \leq \sqrt{2C'_{\epsilon,\theta_0}}h^{-3/4}$. □

4.3 Agmon-type lower-bound for the first eigenfunction

Property 20. Let $w_\alpha(x) = v_\alpha(x)e^{\alpha x^2/2}$. For all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $c > 0$ such that for all α in $[0, +\infty)$ and x in $(-1+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon)$, $w_\alpha(x) \geq c$.

Proof. The idea is to write $w_\alpha(x) = \sum a_n x^n$ and to estimate the coefficients. Since w_α satisfies $-w_\alpha'' + 2x\alpha w_\alpha' - \rho(\alpha) w_\alpha = 0$, we have for $n \geq 0$, $a_{n+2} = \frac{2\alpha n - \rho(\alpha)}{(n+1)(n+2)} a_n$. Since w_α is even, we have $a_{2n+1} = 0$. We have $a_0 = 1$, $a_2 = -\frac{\rho(\alpha)}{2}$, and, assuming that α is big enough so that $\rho(\alpha) \leq 2\alpha$, we have by induction $|a_{n+2}| \leq \frac{2\alpha n}{(n+1)(n+2)} |a_n| \leq \frac{2\alpha}{n+2} |a_n|$. So, for $n \geq 2$, we have $|a_{2n}| \leq \frac{\rho(\alpha)}{2} \alpha^n \frac{1}{n!}$. So, for all reals x, $|w_\alpha(x) - 1| \leq \frac{\rho(\alpha)}{2} \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\alpha^n}{n!} x^{2n} = \frac{\rho(\alpha)}{2} (e^{\alpha x^2} - 1)$. Since $\rho(\alpha) \sim 4\pi^{-1/2} \alpha^{3/2} e^{-\alpha}$, there exists $C > 0$, such that for any $|x| < 1 - \epsilon$, we have $|w_\alpha(x) - 1| \leq C \alpha^{3/2} e^{-\alpha(1-(1-\epsilon)^2)}$.

Since $1 - (1-\epsilon)^2 > 0$, this proves that for α big enough, say $\alpha > M$, and $|x| < 1 - \epsilon$, we have $w_\alpha(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. But $w_\alpha(x)$ is continuous in (x, α), and never vanishes for $x \in [-1 + \epsilon, 1 - \epsilon]$, $\alpha \geq 0$. So, we have $c := \inf_{(x,\alpha) \in [-1+\epsilon, 1-\epsilon] \times [0, M]} w_\alpha(x) > 0$, and, for any $\alpha > 0$ and $|x| < 1 - \epsilon$, we have $w_\alpha(x) \geq \min(c, \frac{1}{2})$. □

5 Proof of the non null-controllability of the Grushin equation

We finally prove the main theorem, that we restate here:

Theorem 2. *Let $[a, b]$ be a non-trivial segment of $\mathbf{T}$, let $\omega = (-1, 1) \times (\mathbf{T} \setminus [a, b])$ and $T > 0$. The Grushin equation is not controllable in ω in time T.*

Proof of theorem 2. We already mentioned in the outline of the proof (see section 2.4) that the controllability of the Grushin equation would imply that for all sequences (a_n) of complex numbers with $\sum |a_n|^2 < +\infty$, with $f = \sum a_n z^n$:

$$\int_{x \in (-1,1)} \left(\int_{y \in \mathbf{T}} \left| \sum_j \frac{(-t)^j}{j!} H_{\rho^j v(x)}(f)(z(T, y)) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x$$
$$\leq C \int_{x \in (-1,1)} \left(\int_{(t,y) \in [0,T] \times \omega_y} \left| \sum_j \frac{(-t)^j}{j!} H_{\rho^j v(x)}(f)(z(t, y)) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}t \, \mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x$$

by the change of variables $z = e^{-t+iy}$ with Jacobian $|J_z| = |z|^2$, this would imply in turn for every entire function f with $f(0) = 0$:

$$\int_{x \in (-1,1)} \left(\int_{D(0, e^{-T})} \left| z^{-1} \sum_j \frac{(-\ln|z|)^j}{j!} H_{v(x)\rho^j}(f)(z) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}|z| \right) \mathrm{d}x$$
$$\leq C \int_{x \in (-1,1)} \left(\int_{\mathcal{D}} \left| z^{-1} \sum_j \frac{(-\ln|z|)^j}{j!} H_{v(x)\rho^j}(f)(z) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}|z| \right) \mathrm{d}x \quad (13)$$

where, as in the toy model, we write $\mathrm{d}|z|$ the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbf{C} \simeq \mathbf{R}^2$ and $\mathcal{D} = \{e^{-T} < |z| < 1, \arg(z) \notin [a,b]\}$. The rest of this proof is about finding a counterexample of this inequality.

In the toy model (section 2.3), we chose a sequence of polynomials that converges to $z \mapsto 1/z$ on every compacts of $\mathbf{C} \setminus e^{i\theta}\mathbf{R}_+$, but here, we will chose something slightly different. First, let's chose $\theta = \frac{1}{2}(a+b)$. Let $z_0 = e^{i\theta - T - 1/4}$, and let $\tilde{p}_k$ be a sequence of polynomials that converges uniformly on every compact of $\mathbf{C} \setminus (z_0 + e^{i\theta}\mathbf{R}_+)$ to $z \mapsto (z - z_0)^{-1}$. Such a sequence exists thanks to Runge's theorem (property 4). Finally, let $n_0 \geq 0$ an integer greater than $\inf_\theta r(\theta)$ (where ρ and $v(x)$ are in $S(r)$) and such that for all $n \geq n_0$, $\rho_n e^{n/2} < 1$ (such a n_0 exists thanks to the asymptotic ρ_n, see theorem 16). We chose $p_k(z) = z^{n_0}\tilde{p}_k(z)$.

Here is a refinement of estimate 5, which will be useful to estimate terms in the above "holomorphic observability inequality" for large j:

Property 21. Let $c = (c_n)$ be sequence of complex numbers such that for some $\lambda > 0$, $\sup_{n \geq n_0} |c_n e^{\lambda n}| < +\infty$. Then, noting M this supremum, we have for all entire functions $f = \sum_{n \geq n_0} a_n z^n$, $|H_c(f)|_{L^2(D(0,R))} \leq M e^{\lambda} |f|_{L^2(D(0,e^{-\lambda}R))}$.

Proof. We write $c_n = b_n e^{-\lambda n}$, then $H_c = H_b H_{e^{-\lambda n}}$ and $H_{e^{-\lambda n}}(f)(z) = f(e^{-\lambda}z)$. Then, thanks to property 5, $|H_c|_{L^2(D(0,R))} \leq M |f(e^{-\lambda}\,\cdot)|_{L^2(D(0,R))}$. The change of variables $z' = e^{-\lambda}z$ in the integral $\int_{D(0,R)} |f(e^{-\lambda}z)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}z$ allows us to conclude. ◊

We will apply this estimate to $c_n = v_n(x)\rho_n^j$ (we recall that we note λ_n the first eigenvalue of $-\partial_x^2 + (nx)^2$ on $(-1,1)$, that v_n is the associated eigenvector normalized by $v_n(0) = 1$, and that $\lambda_n = n + \rho_n$). This sequence satisfies by choice of n_0 and thanks to theorems 16 and 18 $|c_n| \leq C e^{-jn/2}$ for some C independent on $x \in (-1,1)$, $j \geq 0$ and $n \geq n_0$.

Finally, let's introduce some notation to use the estimate on holomorphy default operators (theorem 13). Let j_0 be an integer greater than $2(T + 1/4)$ and let $U = \{|z| < 1, \arg(z) \notin [a,b]\} \cup D(0, e^{-j_0})$; U is a bounded open domain, star-shaped with respect to 0, that contain $\mathcal{D}$, and such that $\mathrm{distance}(U, z_0 + e^{i\theta}\mathbf{R}_+) > 0$. So let $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta < \mathrm{distance}(U, z_0 + e^{i\theta}\mathbf{R}_+)$.

Estimate of the right-hand side Let's first look at the right hand side of the "holomorphic observability inequality" (13), and prove it is bounded when applied to $f = p_k$. We first want to show that $|H_{v(x)\rho^j} p_k|_{L^2(\mathcal{D})} \leq M$ for some M independent on $x \in (-1,1)$, $k \geq 0$ and $j \geq 0$.

For $j \geq j_0$, we have $|v(x)\rho_n^j| \leq C_1 e^{-j_0 n/2}$, so thanks to property 21, for all entire functions f, $|H_{v(x)\rho^j}(f)|_{L^2(\mathcal{D})} \leq C_1 e^{j_0} |f|_{L^2(D(0,e^{-j_0/2}))}$. Since $j_0/2 > T + 1/4$, p_k converges uniformly on $D(0, e^{-j_0/2})$ to a bounded function, so, we have $|H_{v(x)\rho^j}|_{L^2(\mathcal{D})} \leq M$ for some M independent on $x \in (-1,1)$, $k \geq 0$ and $j \geq j_0$.



Figure 5: Left figure: in yellow, the domain $\mathcal{D}$, in red, the disk $D(0, e^{-T})$ and in blue, the point z_0 and the half-line $z_0 + e^{i\theta}\mathbf{R}_+$. Since p_k converges to $z \mapsto z^{n_1}(z - z_0)^{-1}$ away from the blue line, the L^∞ norm of p_k over $\mathcal{D}^\delta$ is bounded, as long as $\delta <$ distance$(z_0, \mathcal{D})$. Right figure: a zoom over the disk $D(0, e^{-T})$. Since $v_n(x) \geq ce^{-nx^2/2}$, the operator $H_{v(x)}$ is similar to a contraction of the domain of definition by a factor of $e^{-x^2/2}$, so for x small, z_0 is still inside this contracted ring. Thus, the L^2 norm of $H_{v(x)}(p_k)$ over $\mathcal{C}$ tends to $+\infty$ uniformly in x small.

For the firsts j, thanks estimates on v_n (property 18) and ρ_n (theorem 16), $(v(x)\rho^j)_{x\in(-1,1)}$ is a bounded family of $S(r)$ for some $r : (0, \pi/2) \to \mathbf{R}_+$, so thanks to Hölder inequality estimate on holomorphy default operators (theorem 13) $|H_{v(x)\rho^j}(f)|_{L^2(\mathcal{D})} \leq \sqrt{\pi}|H_{v(x)\rho^j}(f)|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C_j|f|_{L^\infty(U^\delta)}$. By choice of U and δ, $|p_k|_{L^\infty(U^\delta)}$ is bounded in k, so, $|H_{v(x)\rho^j}(p_k)|_{L^2(\mathcal{D})}$ is bounded for the firsts j, uniformly in $k \geq 0$ and $x \in (-1, 1)$.

So, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{x\in(-1,1)}\left(\int_{\mathcal{D}}\left|z^{-1}\sum_j\frac{(\ln|z|)^j}{j!}H_{v(x)\rho^j}(p_k)(z)\right|^2\mathrm{d}|z|\right)\mathrm{d}x\\
&\leq\int_{x\in(-1,1)}\left(e^{2T}\left(\sum_j\frac{T^j}{j!}|H_{v(x)\rho^j}(p_k)|_{L^2(\mathcal{D})}\right)^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\\
&\leq\int_{x\in(-1,1)}\left(e^{2T}\left(\sum_j\frac{MT^j}{j!}\right)^2\right)\mathrm{d}x\\
&\leq 2M^2e^{4T}
\end{aligned}$$

Estimate of the left-hand side Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the ring $\{e^{-T-1}<|z|<e^{-T}\}$ and $\mathcal{C}'=\{e^{-T-1}<|z|<e^{-T-1/8}\}$. We want to show that the term for $j=0$ tends to $+\infty$, while the sum of the other terms stays bounded. We start by writing:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{x\in(-1,1)}\left(\int_{D(0,e^{-T})}\left|z^{-1}\sum_j\frac{(\ln|z|)^j}{j!}H_{v(x)\rho^j}(p_k)(z)\right|^2\mathrm{d}|z|\right)\mathrm{d}x\\
&\geq\int_{x^2\leq 1/8}\left(\int_{\mathcal{C}}\left|z^{-1}\sum_j\frac{(\ln|z|)^j}{j!}H_{v(x)\rho^j}(p_k)(z)\right|^2\mathrm{d}|z|\right)\mathrm{d}x\\
&\geq e^{2T}\int_{x^2\leq 1/8}\left(\int_{\mathcal{C}}\left|\sum_j\frac{(\ln|z|)^j}{j!}H_{v(x)\rho^j}(p_k)(z)\right|^2\mathrm{d}|z|\right)\mathrm{d}x
\end{aligned}$$

The property 21 shows that for some C independent on $x\in(-1,1), j\geq 1$, $|H_{v(x)\rho^j}(f)|_{L^2(\mathcal{C})}\leq C|f|_{L^2(D(0,e^{-T-1/2}))}$. By choice of p_k, p_k is uniformly bounded on $D(0,e^{-T-1/2})$, so, for some M' independent on $x\in(-1,1)$, $k\geq 0$ and $j\geq 1$, we have $|H_{v(x)\rho^j}(p_k)|_{L^2(\mathcal{C})}\leq M'$. So, we have:

$$\sum_{j\geq 1}\frac{(T+1)^j}{j!}|H_{v(x)\rho^j}(p_k)|_{L^2(\mathcal{C})}\leq M'e^{T+1} \tag{14}$$

About the term for $j=0$ in the left-hand side of inequality (13), we write $v_n(x)=w_n(x)e^{-nx^2/2}$. Then, we have for $x^2\leq 1/8$:

$$\begin{aligned}
|H_{v(x)}(p_k)|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{C})}&\geq|H_{w(x)e^{-nx^2/2}}(p_k)|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{C})}\\
&=|H_{w(x)}(p_k(e^{-x^2/2}\,\cdot))|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{C})}
\end{aligned}$$

Then, thanks to the lower bound on w (property 20) and the orthogonality of the functions $z \mapsto z^n$ on $\mathcal{C}$, we have for some c independent on $x \in (-\frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}})$, $|H_{w(x)}(f)|_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} \geq c|f|_{L^2(\mathcal{C})}$. Thus, we have, for $x^2 \leq 1/8$:

$$\begin{aligned} |H_{v(x)}(p_k)|^2_{L^2(D(0,e^{-T}))} &\geq c^2 |p_k(e^{-x^2/2}\,\cdot)|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} \\ &= c^2 e^{x^2/2} |p_k|^2_{L^2(e^{-x^2/2}\mathcal{C})} \\ &\geq c^2 |p_k|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{C}_2)} \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Since p_k converges to $z^{n_0}(z-z_0)^{-1}$ uniformly in every compact of $\mathbf{C}\backslash(z_0+e^{i\theta}\mathbf{R}_+)$ with $z_0 \in \mathcal{C}_2$, $|p_k|_{L^2(\mathcal{C}_2)} \to +\infty$ when $k \to +\infty$. So, combining estimates (14) and (15), for $x^2 \leq 1/8$ and $k \geq k_{\min}$ (with $k_{\min}$ independent of x), we have $|H_{v(x)}(p_k)|_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} - \sum_{j\geq 1}(T+1)^j/j!|H_{v(x)\rho^j}(p_k)|_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} \geq 0$.

So, we have for $k \geq k_{\min}$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{x\in(-1,1)} \left(\int_{D(0,e^{-T})} \left| z^{-1} \sum_j \frac{(\ln|z|)^j}{j!} H_{v(x)\rho^j}(p_k)(z) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}|z| \right) \mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq \int_{x^2\leq 1/8} e^{2T} \left(|H_{v(x)}(p_k)|_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} - \sum_{j\geq 1} \frac{(T+1)^j}{j!} |H_{v(x)\rho^j}(p_k)|_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} \right)^2 \mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq e^{2T} \int_{x^2\leq 1/8} \left(c|p_k|_{L^2(\mathcal{C}_2)} - \sum_{j\geq 1} \frac{(T+1)^j}{j!} M' \right)^2 \mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{2T} \left(c|p_k|_{L^2(\mathcal{C}_2)} - M' e^{T+1} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

So, the left-hand side of the holomorphic observability inequality (13) tends to $+\infty$ when $k \to \infty$, which proves that this holomorphic observability inequality is not true. □

6 Conclusion and open problems

Let's remark that we looked at the Grushin equation on $(-1,1)\times\mathbf{T}$ for convenience, but the situation is the same for the Grushin equation on $(-1,1)\times(0,1)$ (see appendix C.1). So, if we combine our result with the previous ones [3, 4], all of the following situations can happen depending on the control domain ω:

- the Grushin equation is controllable in any time, for instance if $\omega = (0,a)\times(0,1)$;

- the Grushin equation is controllable in large time, but not in small time, for instance if $\omega = (a, b) \times (0, 1)$ with $0 < a < b$;
- the Grushin equation is never controllable, for instance if $\omega = (-1, 1) \times ((0, 1) \setminus [a, b])$ with $0 \leq a < b \leq 1$.

A pattern that seems to appear in the controllability of degenerate parabolic equations is that the controllability holds in any time when the degeneracy is weak, and never holds when the degeneracy is strong. Our result may indicate that obtaining general results on the controllability of parabolic equation degenerating inside the domain will be difficult in the critical case, i.e. when the degeneracy is neither strong nor weak.

On the Grushin equation, null-controllability is still an open problem for domains that do not fall into one of the three domain type we described before.

Appendix A The stationary phase theorem

We prove here the following theorem:

Theorem 22. *There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $u \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R})$, $N \in \mathbf{N}$ and $\alpha \in \{\alpha \neq 0, \Re(\alpha) \geq 0\}$:*

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-\alpha x^2/2} u(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2^k k! \alpha^{k+1/2}} u^{(2k)}(0) + S_N(u, \alpha)$$

where α^s is defined to be $e^{s \ln \alpha}$, with the principal determination of the logarithm, and $S_N(u, \alpha)$ satisfying:

$$|S_N(u, \alpha)| \leq \frac{C}{2^N N! |\alpha|^{N+1/2}} \sum_{k=0}^{2} \|u^{(2N+k)}\|_{L^1}$$

Proof. Since the proof is essentially the same as the one provided by Martinez [14, theorem 2.6.1] for the case α purely imaginary, we just give the main ideas.

We define the Fourier transform of u in the Schwartz space by $\mathcal{F}(u)(\xi) = \int_{\mathbf{R}} u(x) e^{-ix\xi}\,\mathrm{d}x$. Then, the Fourier transform of $x \mapsto e^{-\alpha x^2/2}$ is $\mathcal{F}(e^{-\alpha x^2/2})(\xi) = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\alpha}} e^{-\xi^2/2\alpha}$ (this is standard when $\Re(\alpha) > 0$, and by taking the limit in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbf{R})$ for $\alpha + \epsilon \to \alpha$ when α is purely imaginary). So, we have:

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-\alpha x^2/2} u(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha}} \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-\xi^2/(2\alpha)} \mathcal{F}(u)(\xi)\,\mathrm{d}\xi$$

Then, writing

$$e^{-\xi^2/(2\alpha)} = \sum_{k\geq 0} \frac{(-1)^k}{(2\alpha)^k k!}\xi^{2k} = \sum_{k<N} \frac{(-1)^k}{(2\alpha)^k k!}\xi^{2k} + R_N(\xi,\alpha)$$

with, according to Taylor's formula,

$$|R_N(\xi,\alpha)| \leq \frac{\xi^{2N}}{2^N|\alpha|^N N!}$$

we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-\alpha x^2/2}u(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = \sum_{k<N} \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2^k k!\alpha^{k+1/2}}u^{(2k)}(0) + S_N(u,\alpha)$$

with $S_N(u,\alpha) = \int_{\mathbf{R}} R_N(\xi,\alpha)\mathcal{F}u(\xi)\,\mathrm{d}\xi$, that satisfies the estimate stated in the theorem.

We refer to Martinez's proof in the already mentioned book [14] for more details on the computations. □

Here is the version of the stationary phase theorem we will need:

Property 23. Let $\Gamma_{+,\epsilon}$ be the path $(-\infty,\epsilon] \cup \{\epsilon e^{i(\pi-\theta)}, 0 \leq \theta \leq \pi\} \cup [\epsilon,+\infty)$. Let θ in $(0,\pi/2)$. There exists $C_\theta > 0$ such that for all $\alpha \in U_{\theta,1}$, $\rho \in D(0,1)$ and $m \in \{0,1,2\}$, with $f(s) = e^{-(1+\rho/2)\ln(s)}(\ln(s))^m$:

$$\left|\int_{\Gamma_{+,\epsilon}} e^{-\alpha(1+s/2)^2}f(s)\,\mathrm{d}s - 2\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha}}f(-2)\right| \leq C_\theta|\alpha|^{-3/2}$$

Proof. We start by choosing $\chi \in C_c^\infty(-3,-1)$ with $\chi = 1$ on $(-5/2,-3/2)$, and we modify slightly the path $\Gamma_{+,\epsilon}$ so that it is a C^∞ path (the result of the integral of course not depending on this modification of $\Gamma_{+,\epsilon}$), for instance, if ϕ is in $C_c^\infty(-\epsilon,\epsilon)$ with $\phi \geq 0$ and $\phi(0) > 0$, we can choose $\Gamma_+(t) = t + 2i\phi(t)$. Then we write:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\Gamma_{+,\epsilon}} e^{-\alpha(1+s/2)^2}f(s)\,\mathrm{d}s = &\int_{-3}^{-1} e^{-\alpha(1+t/2)^2}\chi(t)f(t)\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &+ \int_{\mathbf{R}\setminus(-5/2,-3/2)} e^{-\alpha(1+\Gamma_+(t)/2)^2}(1-\chi(t))f(\Gamma_+(t))\,\mathrm{d}t\end{aligned}$$

We can apply the previous theorem to the first term, so we only need to show that for some $C'_\theta > 0$, the second term is bounded by $C'_\theta|\alpha|^{-3/2}$. We note $\varphi(t) = (1+\Gamma_+(t)/2)^2 = (1+t/2)^2 - \phi^2(t) + 2i\phi(t)(1+t/2)$ whose only critical point is

-2, and let L the operator defined by $Lu = \frac{1}{\varphi'}u'$ so that $Le^{-\alpha\varphi} = -\alpha e^{-\alpha\varphi}$. So, noting $L^t u = (\frac{1}{\varphi'}u)'$, we have by integration by parts:

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}\setminus(-5/2,-3/2)} e^{-\alpha(1+\Gamma_+(t)/2)^2}(1-\chi(t))f(\Gamma_+(t))\,\mathrm{d}t = \frac{1}{\alpha^2}\int_{\mathbf{R}\setminus(-5/2,-3/2)} e^{-\alpha\varphi(t)}(L^t)^2((1-\chi)f\circ\Gamma_+)(t)\,\mathrm{d}t$$

Then, writing $|e^{-\alpha\varphi(t)}| \leq e^{-\Re(\alpha\varphi(t))}$ and $\Re(\alpha\varphi(t)) = \Re(\alpha)((1+t/2)^2 - \phi^2(t)) - 2(1+t/2)\Im(\alpha)\varphi(t))$. If $|\arg(\alpha)| < \theta$, then for some $c_\theta > 0$, $\Re(\alpha) \geq c_\theta|\alpha|$, and if we choose ϕ small enough, we have for some $c'_\theta > 0$ and all $t \notin (-5/2,-3/2)$, $\Re(\alpha\varphi(t)) \geq c'_\theta|\alpha|(1+t/2)^2$. So, for all α in $U_{\theta,1}$:

$$\left|\int_{\mathbf{R}\setminus(-5/2,-3/2)} e^{-\alpha(1+\Gamma_+(t)/2)^2}(1-\chi(t))f(\Gamma_+(t))\,\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq \frac{1}{|\alpha|^2}|(L^t)^2((1-\chi)f\circ\Gamma_+)|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R}\setminus(-5/2,-3/2))}\int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-c'_\theta|\alpha|t^2/4}\,\mathrm{d}t$$

which concludes the proof. □

Appendix B Newton's method

We prove here that Newton's method can solve equations of the form $\Phi(z) = 0$ by an iterative scheme, assuming the starting point is is close enough to a solution. While such a theorem can be stated in Banach spaces, we will only need it in the complex plane.

Theorem 24. *Let $D = D(0,R)$ be a disk in the complex plane. We will note $5D = D(0,5R)$ and $6D = D(0,6R)$. Let $\Phi : 6D \to \mathbf{C}$ be an holomorphic function such that:*

- *for all $z \in D$, $\Phi(z) \in D$;*
- *For all z in $6D$, $\Phi'(z) \neq 0$.*

Then, noting $C_1 = \sup_{5D}|\Phi''|$ and $C_2 = \sup_{5D}|\Phi'^{-1}|$ and $A = C_1C_2^2$, if z_0 is in D and $|\Phi(z_0)| \leq \min((2A)^{-1}, 2RC_2^{-1})$, then the sequence (z_n) defined by $z_{n+1} = z_n - \Phi'(z_n)^{-1}\Phi(z_n)$ converges and the limit z_∞ satisfies $\Phi(z_\infty) = 0$. Moreover, for all $k \geq 0$, $|z_\infty - z_k| \leq \frac{2}{C_1C_2}|A\Phi(z_0)|^{2^k}$.

Proof. Let $\epsilon_0 = \Phi(z_0)$. We prove by induction the predicate $P(n) : z_n \in 5D$ and $|\Phi(z_n)| \leq A^{-1}(A\epsilon_0)^{2^n}$. About the case $n = 0$, we made the hypothesis $z_0 \in D$, while the inequality just reads $|\Phi(z_0)| \leq |\Phi(z_0)|$.

Now suppose that $P(k)$ holds for all $k \leq n$. Let $v_k = -\Phi'(z_k)^{-1}\Phi(z_k)$, so that $z_{n+1} = z_0 + v_0 + \cdots v_n$. By definition of C_1 and C_2 and the fact that for all $k \leq n$, $z_k \in 5D$, $|z_{n+1}| \leq |z_0| + \sum_{k=0}^{n} C_2 A^{-1}(A\epsilon_0)^{2^k} \leq R + C_2\epsilon_0 \frac{1}{1-A\epsilon_0}$. Since we have by hypothesis $\epsilon_0 \leq \min((2A)^{-1}, 2RC_2^{-1})$, we have $z_{n+1} \leq R + 2C_2\epsilon_0 \leq 5R$, which proves that $z_{n+1} \in 5D$.

In order to prove that $|\Phi(z_{n+1})| \leq A^{-1}(A\epsilon_0)^{2^{n+1}}$, we make a Taylor expansion of Φ about z_n: for all $\delta \in \mathbf{C}$ such that $z_n + \delta \in 5D$:

$$|\Phi(z_n + \delta) - \Phi(z_n) - \delta\Phi'(z_n)| \leq \frac{1}{2}C_1|\delta|^2$$

We then choose δ so that $\Phi(z_n) + \delta\Phi'(z_n)$. We this δ, the previous inequality is $|\Phi(z_{n+1})| \leq \frac{1}{2}C_1|\Phi(z_n)|^2|\Phi'(z_n)^{-1}|^2$. So, by the definition of C_2 and the induction hypothesis, $|\Phi(z_{n+1})| \leq \frac{1}{2}C_1C_2^2\big(A^{-1}(A\epsilon_2)^{2^n}\big)^2 = \frac{1}{2}A^{-1}(A\epsilon_0)^{2^{n+1}}$, which ends the proof of the induction.

By the same kind of computations we made in order to prove $z_{n+1} \in 5D$, we have for $n \geq k$: $|z_n - z_k| \leq C_2 \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} A^{-1}(A\epsilon_0)^{2^j} \leq C_2A^{-1}(A\epsilon_0)^{2^k}\frac{1}{1-A\epsilon_0} \leq 2C_2A^{-1}(A\epsilon_0)^{2^j}$. This proves the stated estimate and that (z_n) converges. Since we have $|\Phi(z_n)| \leq A^{-1}(A\epsilon_0)^{2^n}$, the limit z_∞ satisfies $\Phi(z_\infty) = 0$. □

Appendix C Two variations on the non null controllability of the Grushin equation

C.1 The Grushin equation on the rectangle

We look here at the Grushin equation $\partial_t f - \partial_x^2 f - x^2\partial_y^2 f = \mathbb{1}_\omega$ with $(x, y) \in \Omega = (-1, 1) \times (0, 1)$ and with Dirichlet boundary conditions on Ω. The situation is nearly the same as the Grushin equation on the torus $(-1, 1) \times \mathbf{T}$:

Theorem 25. *Let $[a, b]$ be a non trivial segment of $(0, 1)$, $\omega_y = (0, 1) \setminus [a, b]$, $\omega = (-1, 1) \times \omega_y$ and $T > 0$. The Grushin equation on Ω is not controllable on ω in times T.*

Sketch of the proof. This time, we look for a counterexample of the observability inequality among linear combinations of the eigenfunctions Φ_n defined by

$\Phi_n(x,y) = v_{n\pi}(x)\sin(n\pi y)$. Then, writing $\sin(n\pi y) = \frac{1}{2i}(e^{in\pi y} - e^{-in\pi y})$, we have:

$$\int_{\substack{0<t<T\\-1<x<1\\y\in\omega_y}} \left|\sum a_n e^{-\lambda n\pi t}\Phi_n(x,y)\right|^2 \mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{2}\int_{\substack{0<t<T\\-1<x<1\\y\in\omega_y}} \left(\left|\sum a_n e^{-\lambda n\pi t} v_{n\pi}(x) e^{in\pi y}\right|^2 + \left|\sum a_n e^{-\lambda n\pi t} v_{n\pi}(x) e^{-in\pi y}\right|^2\right) \mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y$$



Figure 6: The domain $\mathcal{D}$ for the Grushin equation in the rectangle. We still can't control entire functions in $D(0,e^{-T})$ from their L^2 norm in $\mathcal{D}$.

Therefore, we can do the same proof as in section 5, but with $\mathcal{D} = \{e^{-T} < |z| < 1, |\arg(z)| \in \omega_y\}$ (see figure 6). □

C.2 The case of a tilted control domain

In this section, we look again at the Grushin equation on $(-1,1)\times\mathbf{T}$, but with tilted control domain:

Theorem 26. *Let $[a,b]$ be a non trivial segment of $\mathbf{T}$, let $\alpha\in\mathbf{R}$, $\omega = \{(x,y)\in(-1,1)\times\mathbf{T} \in y-\alpha x \in \mathbf{T}\setminus[a,b]\}$, and a time T with $0<T<\frac{(b-a)^2}{8\alpha^2}$. The Grushin equation is not controllable on ω in time T.*

Sketch of the proof. Let's apply the observability inequality (3) on $f = \sum a_n\Phi_n$

and make the change of variables $x' = x, y' = y - \alpha x$ in the right hand side:

$$\int_{x\in(-1,1)} \left(\int_{y\in\mathbf{T}} |\sum v_n(x) a_n z(T,y)^n |z(T,y)|^{\rho_n}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x$$
$$\leq C \int_{x\in(-1,1)} \left(\int_{(t,y)\in[0,T]\times\omega_y} |\sum v_n(x) a_n e^{-i\alpha n x} z(t,y)^n |z(t,y)|^{\rho_n}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}x$$

By doing the same change of variables as in the non-tilted case, i.e. $z = z(t,y) = e^{-t+iy}$, and writing $e_{\alpha x} = (e^{-in\alpha x})_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ this implies:

$$\int_{x\in(-1,1)} \left(\int_{D(0,e^{-T})} \left| z^{-1} \sum_j \frac{(-\ln|z|)^j}{j!} H_{v(x)\rho^j}(f)(z) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}|z| \right) \mathrm{d}x$$
$$\leq C \int_{x\in(-1,1)} \left(\int_{\mathcal{D}} \left| z^{-1} \sum_j \frac{(-\ln|z|)^j}{j!} H_{e_{\alpha x} v(x)\rho^j}(f)(z) \right|^2 \mathrm{d}|z| \right) \mathrm{d}x \quad (16)$$

Let $\theta = (a+b)/2$ and r such that $e^{-(b-a)^8/(2\alpha^2)} < e^{-r} < e^{-T}$, and $z_0 = e^{-r+i\theta}$. With n_0 as in the non tilted case, we chose $p_k = z^{n_0}\tilde{p}_k$ with $\tilde{p}_k$ converging uniformly on every compacts of $\mathbf{C} \setminus (z_0 + e^{i\theta}\mathbf{R}_+)$ to $z \mapsto (z - z_0)^{-1}$.

The left hand side of the inequality (16) is the same as in the non tilted case, it tends to $+\infty$ as $k \to +\infty$. The proof of the boundedness of the right hand side is also similar to the proof in the non-tilted case, but we have to account for the $e^{-i\alpha x n}$ factor that rotates the domain.

Indeed, if $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough so that $(1-\epsilon)(b-a)^2/(8\alpha^2) > r$, we write $e_{\alpha x} v(x) = ({}^{\epsilon}w_n(x) e^{-in\alpha x - (1-\epsilon)nx^2/2})_{n\in\mathbf{N}}$ (with ${}^{\epsilon}w(x)$ defined in property 18), so that $H_{e_{\alpha x} v(x)\rho^j}(f)(z) = H_{{}^{\epsilon}w(x)\rho^j}(f)(e^{-(1-\epsilon)x^2/2 - i\alpha x} z)$. Then, the condition $(1-\epsilon)(b-a)^2/(8\alpha^2) > r$ ensures that z_0 is not in $e^{-(1-\epsilon)x^2/2 - i\alpha x}\mathcal{D}$ for any x in $(-1,1)$ (see figure 7). So, for every j, $|H_{e_{\alpha x} v(x)\rho^j}(p_k)|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{D})}$ is uniformly bounded in x. The rest of the proof is the same. □



Figure 7: A portion of $D(0, e^{-T})$ in red, and of $\mathcal{D}$ in yellow. In lighter yellow, the $e^{-x^2/2+i\alpha x}\mathcal{D}$ for $x \in (-1, 1)$. The condition $T < (b-a)^2/(8\alpha^2)$ ensures that we can find a z_0 in $D(0, e^{-T})$ that is not in any $e^{-x^2/2+i\alpha x}\mathcal{D}$.

Acknowledgments: The author thanks his Ph.D. advisor, Gilles Lebeau, for the relation between the Grushin equation and the toy model, as well as many other ideas, and many fruitful discussions.

References

[1] Shmuel Agmon. *Lectures on Exponential Decay of Solution of Second-order Elliptic Equations. Bounds on Eigenfunctions of N-body Schrödinger Operators*. Mathematical Notes 29. Princeton University Press, 1982.

[2] Karine Beauchard. "Null controllability of Kolmogorov-type equations". In: *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems* 26 (2014), pp. 67–101.

[3] Karine Beauchard, Piermarco Cannarsa, and Roberto Guglielmi. "Null controllability of Grushin-type operators in dimension two". In: *Journal of the European Mathematical Society* 16.1 (2014), pp. 67–101.

[4] Karine Beauchard, Luc Miller, and Morgan Morancey. *2D Grushin-type equations: minimal time and null controllable data*. preprint. 2014. URL: http://w3.bretagne.ens-cachan.fr/math/people/karine.beauchard/Preprint_Grushin.pdf.

[5] Karine Beauchard and Karel Pravda-Starov. *Null controllability of hypoelliptic quadratic differential equations*. Version 1. Mar. 17, 2016. arXiv:1603.05367 [math.AP].

[6] Karine Beauchard and Karel Pravda-Starov. *Null controllability of non-autonomous Ornstein-Uhlenbeck equations*. Version 1. July 19, 2016. arXiv:1607.05433 [math.AP].

[7] Karine Beauchard, Bernard Helffer, Raphael Henry, and Luc Robbiano. "Degenerate parabolic operators of Kolmogorov type with a geometric control condition". In: *ESAIM Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations* 21 (2015), pp. 67–101.

[8] Piermarco Cannarsa, Patrick Martinez, and Judith Vancostenoble. "Carleman estimates for a class of degenerate parabolic operators". In: *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 47.1 (2008), pp. 1–19.

[9] Piermarco Cannarsa, Patrick Martinez, and Judith Vancostenoble. "Global Carleman estimates for degenerate parabolic operators with applications". In: *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society* 239.1133 (2016).

[10] Thomas Duyckaerts and Luc Miller. "Resolvent conditions for the control of parabolic equations". In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 263 (2012), pp. 3641–3673.

[11] A. V. Fursikov and O. Yu Immanuvoiov. *Controllability of evolution equations*. Lectures Note Series 34. Seoul National University Research Institute of Mathematics Global Analysis Research Center, 1996.

[12] Bernard Helffer and Johannes Sjöstrand. "Multiple wells in the semi-classical limit I". In: *Communications in Partial Differential Equations* 9.4 (1984), pp. 337–408.

[13] Gilles Lebeau and Luc Robbiano. "Contrôle exact de l'équation de la chaleur". In: *Communications in Partial Differential Equations* 20.1–2 (1995), pp. 335–356.

[14] André Martinez. *An introduction to Semiclassical and Microlocal Analysis*. Universitext. Springer Science+Business Media, 2002.

[15] Luc Miller. "On the controllability of anomalous diffusions generated by the fractional Laplacian". In: *Mathematcis of Control, Signals and Systems* 18.3 (2006), pp. 260–271.

[16] Walter Rudin. *Real and Complex Analysis*. 3rd ed. McGraw-Hill Education, 1987.